

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/567,122	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHUISKY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Magali P. Slawski	<b>Art Unit</b> 1728	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Magali P. Slawski.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Mr. Christopher P. Bruenjes.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 23 March 2011
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

Koshiba (US 5,187,033)

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*The examiner called Applicant's attorney to propose an examiner's amendment. We agreed to change the claims in order to clear the claims of both art and 112 2nd paragraph rejections and, in some instances, to make the claims more clear without changing their scope.*

*Claim 1 was first amended to overcome a 112 2nd paragraph rejection based on indefiniteness. Claim 1 had originally recited an electrically insulating layer doped with an alkali metal yet comprising an oxide layer consisting essentially of a metal oxide. There was a conflict between "consisting essentially of" one thing and "doped" with something else. To resolve this conflict, we introduced the language "consisting essentially of a dielectric oxide [...] doped with an alkali metal."*

*Claim 1 was then amended to overcome a 102(b) rejection with Koshiba. As explained in the reasons for allowance, Koshiba (figure 1) teaches a metallic strip (7) coated with a layer (5) of one the claimed metal oxides doped with an alkali metal. Koshiba also teaches an electrically insulating separator (6) on the oxide layer (5). Before amendment, the claim recited an electrically insulating layer \*comprising\* an oxide layer. If that language had not been changed to recite an electrically insulating doped oxide layer, the examiner could have rejected the claim by calling the combination of Koshiba's electrically insulating separator (6) and Koshiba's doped oxide layer (5) and electrically insulating layer comprising a doped oxide layer. To avoid this rejection, we changed the language to an "electrically insulating oxide layer consisting essentially of" the claimed ingredients.*

*Claims 3, 6, 12, 16 and 18 were amended to avoid a 112 2nd rejection based on lack of antecedent basis. All references to the oxide layer or the oxide coating were replaced with the "electrically insulating oxide layer." The examiner checked the specification to ensure that there was support for these changes.*

/Jennifer K. Michener/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1728

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)